

July 6, 1999

G:\MINUTES\FY99MIN\EC03089.FIN

SCIENCE ADVISORY BOARD  
Executive Committee Meeting  
Public Conference Call  
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency  
401 M Street, SW, Washington, DC Room M3709  
March 8, 1999

I. Attendees

Dr. Joan Daisey (Chair)  
Dr. Henry Anderson  
Dr. Richard Bull  
Dr. Kenneth Cummins  
Dr. Hilary Inyang  
Dr. Morton Lippmann  
Dr. Genevieve Matanoski  
Dr. Joe Mauderly  
Dr. Granger Morgan  
Dr. W. Randall Seeker  
Dr. Ellen Silbergeld  
Dr. William Smith  
Dr. Mark Utell  
Dr. Terry Young

Others

Dr. Costel Denson, Chair ORD Board of Scientific Counselors

Dr. Donald Barnes, Designated Federal Officer

Others present in Room M3709 are listed on the sign-in sheet (Attachment A).

II. Agenda

The meeting was convened at 11:00 AM EDT and for consideration of the report from the Research Strategies Advisory Committee, dealing with the Agency's FY2000 scientific budget. Reports on the "Data from the Testing of Human Subjects" and the "Index of Watershed Indicators" are still being developed by their respective committees.

III. Review of RSAC's Report on the Science and Technology Component of the FY2000 Presidential Budget Request

Dr. Daisey, Lead Discussant, complimented the RSAC in generating such a fine report in such a short period of time. She suggested a number places that would be helped by clarifications.

Dr. Mauderly, Associate Discussant, also endorsed the report but noted that a number of pithy, eye-catching statements in the transmittal letter were not developed further with supporting detail in the report per se. He also identified some places where the bottom-line should be stated more directly; e.g., "Is the budget adequate or not?"

In the ensuing discussion, many members spoke, endorsing the report and expressing the hope that the production schedule (three days) would not become the expected standard for SAB projects of the future. Among the points made were the following:

- A. The Agency's planning process should initially generate a list of scientific priorities.
- B. This prioritized list should be evaluated in the context of an articulated vision of science at EPA and in the federal government.
- C. Funds should be allocated to items in the list according to priorities.
- D. Relatively high priority areas that are not funded should be identified and discussed.
- E. The Agency's position for various component (e.g., exploratory grants) would be strengthened by citing past examples in which timely support had prepared the Agency to address (or avoid) a difficult problem for example, Agency forward-thinking research on harmful algal blooms put the Agency in a good position to address the pfiesteria problem as it has emerged over the past two years.
- F. The Agency's limited research budget makes it difficult to mount a truly credible research program, particularly one that encompasses so many areas.
- G. The Agency needs to take steps to ensure the "doing more research" is not used as an excuse not to take needed regulatory action.

- H. The Agency should expand its efforts in inter-agency collaboration in order to leverage its limited resources.
- I. The Agency should not make the mistake of simply generating and transmitting more and more information to the public, without also making the effort to educate the public so that they can understand and appropriately utilize the information.

**ACTION:** The Executive Committee approved the "Review of the Science and Technology Component of the FY2000 Presidential Budget Request for the US Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)," subject to final edits. There is no need for further review by the Executive Committee or by the vettors.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/

Donald G. Barnes, Ph.D.  
EC Designated Federal Officer

Concurred,

/s/

Joan M. Daisey, Ph.D.  
SAB EC Chair

## ATTACHMENTS

ATTACHMENT A: Sign-in sheet for those in M3709

ATTACHMENT B: Draft RSAC Report on the FY2000 Science Budget